



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/576,432

04/20/2006

Valerie Sacrez Liebhold

PU030272

2396

24498

7590

07/09/2008

Joseph J. Laks

Thomson Licensing LLC

2 Independence Way, Patent Operations

PO Box 5312

PRINCETON, NJ 08543

EXAMINER

MENDOZA, JUNIOR O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/576,432	Applicant(s) LIEBHOLD, VALERIE SACREZ	
	Examiner JUNIOR O. MENDOZA	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed on 04/20/2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because reference "Scart Connector" Web Page published from Sound and Vision/Engineering/SCART was not submitted with the IDS forms therefore it cannot be considered as prior art.

It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2623

3. **Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 19, 20 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sampsell (Patent No us 6,219,839). Hereinafter referenced as Sampsell.

Regarding **claim 1**, Sampsell discloses a method for use in a video input switching device for configuring devices coupled thereto (Col. 4 lines 17-23), the method comprising:

detecting a device coupled to a video input of the video input switching device (Col 8 lines 28-34 also exhibited on fig 11);

and prompting a user to select a label for the detected device, wherein the label associates the detected device with the video input (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11).

Regarding **claim 2**, Sampsell discloses the method of claim 1; moreover, Sampsell discloses that the detecting step includes the step of detecting a cable coupled to the video input (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11).

Regarding **claim 3**, Sampsell discloses the method of claim 1; moreover, Sampsell discloses that the detecting step includes the step of detecting a signal received through the video input (Col. 4 lines 66-67; col. lines 1-10; col. 8 lines 28-51 also exhibited on figure 11).

Regarding **claim 5**, Sampsell discloses the method of claim 1; moreover, Sampsell discloses that the video input switching device is a television set (Col. 4 lines 5-10 also exhibited on figure 1).

Regarding **claim 7**, Sampsell discloses a method for use in a video input switching device for configuring devices coupled thereto (Col. 4 lines 17-23), the method comprising:

detecting a device coupled to a video input of the video input switching device (Col 8 lines 28-34 also exhibited on fig 11);

responsive to the detected device, displaying a picture for prompting a user to select a label for use in associating the detected device with the video input (Col 8 lines 28-51 also exhibited on figure 11; where the picture displayed is an OSD).

and receiving a response from the user to select the label that associates the detected device with the video input (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11).

Regarding **claims 8, 9 and 11**, Sampsell discloses all the limitations of claims 8, 9 and 11; therefore, claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

Regarding **claim 19**, Sampsell discloses a home entertainment system (Col. 4 lines 17-23), comprising:

a peripheral device (figure 1);

and a video input switching device having at-least-one video input and coupled to the peripheral device through the at-least-one video input (Col 8 lines 28-34 also exhibited on fig 11),

wherein the video input switching device automatically prompts a user to select a label for the peripheral device upon detection of the peripheral device through the at-least-one video input (Col 8 lines 28-51 also exhibited on figure 11).

Regarding **claims 20 and 21**, Sampsell discloses all the limitations of claims 20 and 21; therefore, claims 20 and 21 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 2 and 3, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 4, 10, 13, 14 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampsell in view of Asakura (Patent No US 6,490,009). Hereinafter, referenced as Asakura.

Regarding **claim 4**, Sampsell discloses the method of claim 3; moreover, Sampsell discloses the detecting a signal step (Col. 4 lines 66-67; col. lines 1-10; col. 8 lines 28-51 also exhibited on figure 11).

However, it is noted that Sampsell fails to explicitly disclose prompting the user to turn on the device if no signal is initially detected.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Asakura discloses prompting the user to turn on the device if no signal is initially detected (Col. 9 lines 36-40; col. 9 lines 60-63; where the user notified that the input/out terminal is not connected).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sampsell by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Asakura, for the purpose of allowing the users to interact

with any external device in an efficient manner, thus the user can be protected from any misunderstandings.

Regarding **claim 10**, Sampsell and Asakura disclose all the limitations of claim 10; therefore, claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 4.

Regarding **claim 13**, Sampsell discloses a method for use in a video input switching device, the video input switching device including a number of video inputs(Col. 4 lines 17-23), the method comprising:

selecting each one of the number of video inputs and prompting the user to select a label from a list of labels for associating the selected video input with a particular type of peripheral device (Col 8 lines 28-51 also exhibited on figure 11).

However, it is noted that Sampsell fails to explicitly disclose prompting a user to turn on each one of a number of peripheral devices coupled to the video input switching device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Asakura discloses prompting a user to turn on each one of a number of peripheral devices coupled to the video input switching device (Col. 9 lines 36-40; col. 9 lines 60-63; where the user notified that the input/out terminal is not connected).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sampsell by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Asakura, for the purpose of allowing the users to interact

with any external device in an efficient manner, thus the user can be protected from any misunderstandings.

Regarding **claim 14**, Sampsell and Asakura disclose the method of claim 13; moreover, Sampsell discloses that the prompting step is only performed if a signal is first detected on the selected video input (Col 8 lines 28-51 also exhibited on figure 11; the registry screen appear when receiver detects that a new peripheral device has been added to the system).

Regarding **claim 15**, Sampsell discloses all the limitations of claim 15; therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 5.

6. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampsell in view of Kaiser (Pub No US 2004/0122817). Hereinafter, referenced as Kaiser.

Regarding **claim 6**, Sampsell discloses the method of claim 1; moreover, Sampsell discloses the prompting step (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11).

However, it is noted that Sampsell fails to explicitly disclose the step of playing an audio cue to the user.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Kaiser discloses the step of playing an audio cue to the user (Paragraph [0035]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sampsell by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Kaiser, for the purpose of allowing the users to interact with the on screen display in an efficient and reliable manner, always trying to obtain the user's full attention.

7. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampsell in view of Gospel et al. (Patent No US 6,753,928). Hereinafter, referenced as Gospel.

Regarding **claim 12**, Sampsell discloses the method of claim 7; moreover, Sampsell discloses the displaying a picture step (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11; OSD).

However, it is noted that Sampsell fails to explicitly disclose displaying an image derived from a video signal received from the detected device such that the picture is overlaid over the image.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Gospel discloses displaying an image derived from a video signal received from the detected device such that the picture is overlaid over the image (Col. 6 lines 23-34 also exhibited on fig 3; the OSD is displayed over the video image from the currently selected device).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sampsell by specifically providing the elements

mentioned above, as taught by Gospel, for the purpose of allowing the users to interact with any external device in an efficient and reliable manner.

8. **Claims 16 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugihara et al. (Patent No us 6,122,018) in view of Maxson et al. (Pub No US 2002/0171762) further in view of Rodriguez et al. (Pub NO US 2006/0026665). Hereinafter, referenced as Sugihara, Maxson and Rodriguez, respectively.

Regarding **claim 16**, Sugihara discloses a method for use in a video input switching device (Col. 4 lines 26-43 also exhibited on fig 3A-C), the method comprising:
storing in memory a table comprising a plurality of entries, where at least one entry associates a label with a video input of the video input switching device, wherein the label identifies a device connected to the video input (Col. 1 lines 55-58 figs 3A-C).

However, it is noted that Sugihara fails to explicitly disclose detecting a disconnect from the video input switching device of a device entered in the table and deleting from the table the disconnected device and the label associated therewith.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Maxson discloses detecting a disconnect from the video input switching device of a device entered in the table (Paragraph [0093] figs 2A-C; when a device is disconnected the icon that represents it get grayed out);

and deleting from the table the disconnected device and the label associated therewith (Paragraphs [0014] [0089] also exhibited on fig 9B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sugihara by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Maxson, for the purpose of allowing the users to have more control and manageability over the all the external devices.

However, it is noted that Sugihara and Maxson still fail to explicitly disclose prompting a user to confirm deletion.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rodriguez discloses prompting a user to confirm deletion (Paragraph [0052] also exhibited on figure 6; a user is prompted to confirm the deletion of data).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sugihara and Maxson by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Rodriguez, for the purpose of corroborating the commands inputted by the user.

Regarding **claim 17**, Sugihara Maxson and Rodriguez disclose the method of claim 16; moreover, Sugihara discloses that the video input switching device is a television set (Col. 3 lines 15-20; col. 4 lines 26-43 also exhibited on fig 3A-C).

9. **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugihara in view of Maxson further in view of Rodriguez further in view of Kaiser.

Regarding **claim 18**, Sugihara, Maxson and Rodriguez discloses the method of claim 16; moreover, Sampsell discloses the prompting step (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11).

However, it is noted that Sugihara Maxson and Rodriguez fail to explicitly disclose the step of playing an audio cue to the user.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Kaiser discloses the step of playing an audio cue to the user (Paragraph [0035]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sugihara, Maxson and Rodriguez by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Kaiser, for the purpose of allowing the users to interact with the on screen display in an efficient and reliable manner, always trying to obtain the user's full attention.

10. **Claims 22, 23, 24 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampsell in view of Sugihara.

Regarding **claim 22**, Sampsell discloses a video input switching device (Col. 4 lines 17-23) comprising:

a display (Col. 4 lines 1-16 also exhibited on figure 1);

a number of video inputs (Col. 4 lines 17-43 also exhibited on figure 1);
wherein the processor automatically displays the list of labels and prompts the user to select from the displayed list when the processor detects that a peripheral device has been connected thereto through at least one of the number of video inputs (Col 8 lines 28-51 fig 11).

However, it is noted that Sampsell fails to explicitly disclose a processor and a memory for storing a list of labels, at least some of the labels representing a possible peripheral device that may be coupled to the video input switching device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Sugihara discloses a processor (Col. 3 lines 21-25 fig 1; microcomputer 7);

a memory for storing a list of labels, at least some of the labels representing a possible peripheral device that may be coupled to the video input switching device (Col. 1 lines 55-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sampsell by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Sugihara, for the purpose of including components that are necessary in order to operate the labeling electronic device.

Regarding **claims 23, 24 and 25**, Sampsell and Sugihara disclose all the limitations of claims 23, 24 and 25; therefore, claims 23, 24 and 25 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 5, 2 and 3, respectively.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNIOR O. MENDOZA whose telephone number is (571)270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571)272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

/J. O. M./
July 3, 2008

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623